

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 21, 2006, claim 34 has been amended.

In response to the election requirement, Applicants hereby elect group II, claims 43 – 56 and 62, with traverse.

The justification for the election requirement was that the groups allegedly lacked a single general inventive concept. However, in view of the foregoing amendment, all of the claims now define, among other things, that the refractive index n_1 of the inner cladding background material is larger than the refractive index n_2 of the outer cladding background material.

Applicants now submit that all of the claims now have a common feature that is not taught by the *Furusawa* reference relied upon by the examiner. In *Furusawa*, it appears from the text (page 716, first paragraph, last sentence) that the material of the capillary tubes constituting the background material around the voids of the drawn fiber is the same (and the same as the substrate material used for the (doped) core, Suprasil F300 (quartz)). This indicates that the inner and outer cladding background material indices are the same, i.e., $n_1 = n_2$, using the terms of the present application. Thus, in view of the amendment to claim 34, the justification for the election no longer exists. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the requirement and examiner all of the pending claims.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY LLP

Date: August 21, 2006

By: /WCRowland/
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620